

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1947

The Chaplain, Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, in the midst of the complicated situations of life and the unsolved problems of the world, deliver Thy servants from any sense of futility. Let them feel the support of the prayers of hosts of true patriots throughout this land and, above all, the uplift of the everlasting arms. Cause them to understand that God's power has never been obstructed by difficulties, nor His love limited by the confusion of human plans. May the very failure of man's best resources impel us toward the resources of God. Cleanse our hearts of selfishness. Grant that all questions immediately before us may be made so plain that we shall have no forebodings as we make our decision, nor vain regrets after it is made. For Jesus' sake. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. WHERRY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, February 3, 1947, was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Michigan will unavoidably be obliged to be absent from the Senate on Friday next, and asks the unanimous consent of the Senate that he may be absent on that day.

Without objection, the request is granted.

The Chair announces that the Acting President pro tempore of the Senate at Friday's session will be the junior Senator from California, Mr. KNOWLAND.

## LEAVES OF ABSENCE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate beginning next Monday because of the fact that I find it necessary to go to a hospital for an operation upon my knee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate on the coming Friday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be absent from the Senate Friday of this week and all of next week.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, leave is granted the Senator from Connecticut.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

## REPORT ON NUMBER OF ENLISTED MEN IN THE REGULAR ARMY

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the number of men on active duty on December 31, 1946, who enlisted or reenlisted in the Regular Army after June 1, 1945 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

## AUTHORITY TO GRANT EASEMENTS IN LANDS TO ADMINISTRATOR OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS

A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to grant easements in lands belonging to the United States under his supervision and control, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

## DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. LANGER and Mr. CHAVEZ members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the executive boards of the International Brotherhood of Paper Makers and the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide for the entry into the United States of displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself and Mr. BRICKER):

Petitions of sundry citizens and property owners in Ashtabula County, Ohio, praying that necessary steps be taken to eliminate beach erosion in Ashtabula County; to the Committee on Public Works.

## RURAL ELECTRIFICATION PROGRAM—PETITION

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter in the nature of a petition from members of the Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc., relating to the rural electrification program.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 28, 1947.

HON. WILLIAM LANGER,  
United States Senator,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: You have doubtless read the recent statements of Congressman TABER with regard to the rural electrification program. He is quoted as saying the REA program has been getting three or four times too much money, that it ought to be put on a "business basis," and that he sees no need for continuing the Government agency.

This project has 420 miles of line under construction, which will serve approximately 700 members. We have 1,300 applicants who want service at once. With the least encouragement we could have 1,600 applicants, for we will ultimately serve some 2,000 farm

families. All farmers now want electric service.

REA is cutting down our loan applications because of insufficient loan authorizations. Our request for an allotment for 1947 has not yet been approved. We have never had too much money. There is always a lag between the time you vote the authorization and the time we get it spent, but we can't turn a tap until we get the authorization.

As to the program being put on a business basis, less than one-half of 1 percent of all REA loans are delinquent, and they are paid ahead several million dollars. The Government is making enough clear profit on the money loaned to us over cost to the Government to more than cover the cost of administration. What could be a better "business basis"?

Barely half of the American farms have electricity today. If the agency were eliminated, the program would be wrecked. The biggest bottleneck today is the lack of enough REA personnel to keep the accelerated work moving.

One more thing. We don't want the right of the projects to generate and transmit their own power destroyed. This right helps us get better rates. Also, where power is available from the dams, we want the lines built to deliver it to us and others.

We extend to you an invitation to come out and visit us at your earliest convenience and see our problems first-hand.

We thank you for the splendid support you have given REA in the past, and we are going to count on you more than ever before to take the lead in carrying our program forward.

Yours truly,

Mountrail Electric Cooperative, Inc.,  
Forreut N. Peterson, M. B. Bien,  
E. L. Dekker, Selmer M. Gandrud,  
Henry Strobeck, Leonard Texel,  
Harold J. Nahr, Edna Hermanson.

## RESOLUTIONS OF SENIOR CITIZENS PENSION LEAGUE OF IDAHO

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to two resolutions which have been adopted and addressed to this body by the Senior Citizens Pension League of Idaho. They have been transmitted to me by Mr. C. E. Page, of Boise, Idaho, an official of that league. The resolutions are very brief, and I shall read them. They consist of one sentence each.

No. 1. We respectfully ask both the House and the Senate to pass a law to tax unearned income.

No. 2. We respectfully ask the Senate to establish a luncheon period so the Senate Members will not miss important legislation by being absent in the dining room.

Mr. President, I recall that on various occasions different Members of this body have mentioned the question of a luncheon period, and it would seem to me that when, as the result of discussion, a group in Boise, Idaho—and, I assure my colleagues, without any urging from me—have seen fit to address a resolution to the Senate asking that arrangements be made for a luncheon period, it is a matter of concern, and must be, throughout the country generally.

I subscribe to the idea, Mr. President, that arrangements should be made for a definite luncheon period, with the Senate possibly convening earlier in the morning, and having a definite time to eat, so that Senators may not be necessarily absent from the floor for that purpose.

Matters which come before this body are of too grave a nature to receive the consideration of only a small number of

the Senators, as is too often the case during the period from 12 o'clock to 1:30.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 220. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to American Telephone & Telegraph Co. an easement for communication purposes in certain lands situated in Virginia and Maryland; with an amendment (Rept. No. 13);

S. 221. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant and convey to the Virginia Electric & Power Co. a perpetual easement in two strips of land comprising portions of the Norfolk Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 14);

S. 231. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the city of San Diego a right-of-way over land owned by the United States within the limits of Camp Gillespie, San Diego County, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 15);

S. 234. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the Central of Georgia Railway Co. an easement for railway purposes in certain Government-owned lands situated in Bibb County, Ga.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 16);

S. 235. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Los Angeles, Calif., an easement for construction and operation of a storm drain in and under certain Government-owned lands situated in that city; without amendment (Rept. No. 17); and

S. 276. A bill to provide for payment and settlement of mileage and other travel allowance accounts of military personnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 18).

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) introduced Senate bill 493, to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. WATKINS):

S. 494. A bill to provide for the termination on April 30, 1947, of the effective periods of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, as amended, and the Stabilization Act of 1942, as amended, and to authorize the transfer to State officials of records and other information relating to the establishment and maintenance of maximum rents; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 495. A bill for the relief of Zia Uddin Mustafahassan Qadri; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 496. A bill relating to appointments in the field service of the Post Office Department; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 497. A bill authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to make loans to institutions for the purpose of financing the construction of domiciliary facilities for the aged and the blind; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 498. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell as expeditiously as possible lands acquired or being administered under the provisions of said title III to private persons for purposes not inconsistent with the provisions of the said title III, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BUSHFIELD:

S. 499. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Mrs. Bessie Two Elk-Poor Bear; and

S. 500. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Tom Eagleman; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. WILEY:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of Anna Soucek; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILEY (by request):

S. 502. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB) introduced Senate bill 503, to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 504. A bill to revise the Medical Department of the Army and for other purposes; and

S. 505. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the county of Pittsburg, Okla., a perpetual easement for the construction, maintenance, and operation of a public highway over a portion of the United States Naval Ammunition Depot, McAlester, Okla.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. STEWART (for Mr. KILGORE):

S. 506. A bill for the relief of Jacob Reder and Erna Marcelina Frenkel Reder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAIN:

S. 507. A bill to amend the act of February 12, 1925, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself, Mr. KILGORE, and Mr. MOORE):

S. 508. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, for the purpose of permitting States, and political subdivisions and instrumentalities thereof, to secure coverage for their officers and employees under the old-age and survivors insurance provisions of such act; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 509. A bill to place certain noncommissioned officers on the retired list in the first grade; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 510. A bill to provide for the appointment and compensation of counsel for impoverished defendants in certain criminal cases in the United States district courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Francisco Gamboa Giocochea; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 512. A bill to extend provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act and the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to the Virgin Islands; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. CAPPER (for himself and Mr. WILSON):

S. 513. A bill to restore to the active list of the Army officers retired due to lack of funds, and to promote retired officers who served during a major war and to confer upon Army officers rights already granted Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, and Coast and Geodetic Survey officers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 514. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Sylvia De Cicco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 515. A bill relating to investment of trust funds in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REVERCOMB:

S. 516. A bill to authorize the furnishing of steam from the central heating plant to the property of the Daughters of the American Revolution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MYERS:

S. 517. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 518. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens who were unable to return to the United States prior to October 14, 1946; and

S. 519. A bill for the relief of T. A. Connolly; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BALDWIN (by request):

S. 520. A bill to provide for the furnishing of necessary fixtures and equipment by the Post Office Department at post offices of the third and fourth classes; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. McMAHON:

S. 521. A bill to permit the naturalization of Sang Hun Shim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

S. 522. A bill to authorize the sale of certain lands of the L'Anse Band of Chippewa Indians, Michigan; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. FERGUSON (for himself, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. KILGORE):

S. 523. A bill to incorporate the American Veterans' Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. J. Res. 57. Joint resolution to provide for recognition of the State of Arkansas as a community property State for Federal income-tax purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming introduced Senate Joint Resolution 58, to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming also introduced Senate Joint Resolution 59, authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services, and appears under a separate heading.)

#### TECHNOLOGICAL AND SCIENTIFIC INFORMATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business. I ask unanimous consent that a joint release by myself and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] in connection with the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill introduced by the Senator from Arkansas (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) will



be received and appropriately referred and, without objection, the joint release will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 493) to provide for the coordination of agencies disseminating technological and scientific information, and for the more efficient and orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

The joint release presented by Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. AIKEN) is as follows:

Senators J. W. FULBRIGHT and GEORGE D. AIKEN today introduced a bill providing for the orderly administration of a program to make the discoveries of engineers, inventors, scientists, and technicians more readily available to American industry and business, particularly to small enterprise. It provides a peacetime charter for a businessmen's clearinghouse of technical information, by authorizing the Department of Commerce to continue certain services which have been tested by wartime and postwar experience and found to be needed and demanded by American business.

More than ever before, leadership in industry and business depends upon leadership in technology and, with rising prices, the preservation of the American standards of living depends upon the ability of industry to reduce its cost through the application of technological development, and the development of new techniques. Yet, perhaps, never has it been so difficult as now for the average small manufacturer to keep pace with technology. The bill is designed to meet this situation, molding existing Government facilities into a technical service to business, and providing small business in particular with access to the latest technological developments.

Through channels which the businessman has long used in securing data on foreign and domestic markets, he will obtain, with minimum effort and confusion, technical information originating in all Government departments. In addition to providing for utilization of current Government-sponsored technology, the bill authorizes the continued coordination and dissemination of the backlog of information concerning wartime developments both at home and abroad, as military security permits. Despite the relatively insignificant research directed toward civilian industrial problems, all phases of governmental research, including purely military development, have resulted in products and processes which should be made readily available to industry, bringing about wider public use with fuller commercial exploitation. Especially during the war, Government commitments for research increased rapidly and unless some means is found to effect a broad dissemination of such technical knowledge as can be released to the public this wealth of technological data will be lost, the average businessman denied the opportunity to use the results of research for which he pays the bill as a taxpayer.

Other sections of the bill provide for basic technical aids and services to businessmen and inventors, extends the present authorization of certain funds for research and development, and establishes regulations whereby activities under the bill should be self-sustaining, at least in part. The bill, however, contains adequate safeguards against Government competition with private enterprise, and provides that authority under the act "shall generally be exercised in a manner which will foster the develop-

ment of scientific and technical services by private persons and by State and local institutions."

The basic purpose of the bill is to bring Government-sponsored research and development to contemplated projects where Government assistance or participation is essential to speedily bridging the gap between previous development and widespread public benefit.

A similar measure was introduced in the last Congress by Senator Fulbright (S. 1248). Invitations to testify or comment on the provisions of the bill at that time were submitted to interested research and trade associations, publications, patent attorneys, chambers of commerce, and other business, farm, and veterans' organizations. The testimony was generally favorable as regards both the bill's general objectives and its special provisions as incorporated by the committee after hearings. The bill was reported to the Senate during the last Congress by a unanimous vote (Senate Report 908). The bill has been further revised to conform to existing practices within the Department of Commerce with a view to utilizing all available technical information and coordinate agency activities in a program for the benefit of American industry.

#### CREATION OR CHARTERING OF CERTAIN CORPORATIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB] and myself, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill which would establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes.

The purpose of the bill is to establish a congressional policy with respect to the creation or chartering of a private corporation by act of Congress, and to provide for the effectuation of the policy so established.

Corporations wholly owned or controlled, or to be wholly owned or controlled, by the United States or a department or agency thereof, are specifically exempt from the operation of the bill.

A subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary held extensive hearings on this matter during the Seventy-ninth Congress, and upon a favorable report by the subcommittee, the full committee made an intensive study of the purposes of the bill, and reported it favorably to the Senate, with the result that it passed the Senate unanimously on June 14, 1946. Since that was so near the close of the session, the House of Representatives was unable to take any action.

The similar bill on which hearings were held in the Seventy-ninth Congress was introduced by the Senators from West Virginia [Mr. REVERCOMB and Mr. KILGORE]. I had hoped that the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] would be on the floor at this time so I could ask him to join in the introduction of the bill. I think it is important that the bill I now introduce be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary at this time.

The bill (S. 503) to establish and effectuate a policy with respect to the creation or chartering of certain corporations by act of Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. REVERCOMB), was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### DISTRIBUTION AND PRICING OF SUGAR

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution to permit the extension of sugar rationing and allocations until March 31, 1948.

I do not have to tell the Senate that I am as anxious as anyone to see the end of all controls—particularly on food-stuff—and I am satisfied when there is a normal supply that a continuation of controls is harmful and definitely a restraint to trade. However, in the case of sugar it is different.

In World War I when controls were taken off, the price of sugar increased four times the normal amount, and this high price brought in great shipments of sugar from all over the world. But today, this cannot happen, and there is no comparison between our present sugar situation and the events I have just mentioned. Today there is no sugar anywhere in the world that is not already earmarked, allocated, and sold. No matter how high the price of sugar might go, it would not bring us any more sugar because there is no more sugar to come into this country from any place in the world. Lack of Government control would only cause higher prices and great confusion with the small users losing.

The joint resolution I am introducing continues the control of allocating and pricing of sugar until March 31, 1948, under the Secretary of Agriculture, who, however, has the privilege of taking off any part or all of these controls at any time in his judgment when the supplies of sugar are sufficient to provide for orderly marketing.

This resolution does away with all OPA and executive department controls, placing the responsibility in the Department of Agriculture without creating any new positions or employees.

In a few weeks the War Control Acts will expire and this legislation must be passed quickly to prevent the confusion I have indicated. It is my sincere hope that the controls on sugar can be taken off before the end of 1947, but in the meantime, I believe the legislation I am now proposing is absolutely necessary.

Practically all elements in the sugar field are favoring this extension.

Unless some such legislation as this is enacted, sugar rationing will end with the termination of the Second War Powers Act on March 31, 1947. With the existing world shortage, which cannot be relieved until another sugar crop is harvested, the housewife would have to bid competitively for her sugar against all industrial consumers as well as other nations of the world, and prices might well rise to very great heights.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 58) to extend the powers and authorities under certain statutes with respect to the distribution and pricing of sugar, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

POSTHUMOUS AWARD TO THE LATE LT. GEN. ROY STANLEY GEIGER

Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming. Mr. President, I also introduce for appropriate reference a joint resolution request-

ing that the President issue posthumously to the late Lt. Gen. Roy S. Geiger, of the Marine Corps, a commission as general.

General Geiger, who had served for approximately 40 years in the Marine Corps, died 2 weeks ago—7 days before he would have been placed on the retired list. Being placed on the retired list would have advanced this fine marine officer to the rank of full general under existing law which requires such advance for having been commended in combat with the enemy.

General Geiger was a career aviator in the Marine Corps, being the fourth marine officer designated as an aviator. He actively commanded an aviation group in France in World War I and commanded aviation forces on Guadalcanal and other areas in the Pacific during World War II. Later General Geiger commanded ground forces and after the death, in action, of Lieutenant General Buckner of the Army on Okinawa, General Geiger took command of the Tenth Army and completed the conquest of the island.

Few men, even in the glorious history of the fighting Marine Corps, can equal the splendid combat record of this grand old fighter.

His record through the years has been a shining example to young and old alike of this Nation, and his untimely death has been mourned in every branch of the service.

Mr. President, I wish to point out that, if made, the advancement requested in this joint resolution would involve no additional expense to the Government.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 59), authorizing the President to issue posthumously to the late Roy Stanley Geiger, lieutenant general, United States Marine Corps, a commission as general, United States Marine Corps, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ROBERTSON of Wyoming, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENT

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senators from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY], I submit for appropriate reference an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILEY subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier today the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] submitted an amendment proposing an amendment to section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code. The Senator from Nebraska submitted the amendment at the request of myself and the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. McCARTHY]. The amendment is very brief. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD, and that following it there may be printed a joint statement prepared by the junior Senator from Wisconsin and myself.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment submitted by Mr. WHERRY for Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY is as follows:

Amendment submitted by Mr. WILEY and Mr. McCARTHY to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, viz: At the end of the bill insert a new section as follows:

"Sec. 7. (a) Section 2401 of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended (relating to tax on furs), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'and articles of which such fur is the component material comprising more than 80 percent of the value.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the 15th day following the date of enactment of this act."

The joint statement presented by Mr. WILEY (for himself and Mr. McCARTHY) is as follows:

#### JOINT STATEMENT BY MR. WILEY AND MR. McCARTHY

Section 2401 of the Revenue Act of 1941 as amended by the Revenue Act of 1943, has brought about a discrimination against the use of better quality furs for trimming of cloth garments. This factor is forcing a liquidation of the fur-farming industry.

Our high-quality furs are produced on fur farms, our main products being silver fox and mink. The entire production of silver fox and 70 percent of all mink are raised on farms. The market for these articles is confined to two sources. Approximately 65 percent of all silver foxes and 20 percent of all mink are only suitable for use as trimming on cloth garments. The balance is used in the manufacture of fur garments.

The discriminatory provision of the present tax against the use of better quality fur for trimming purposes has closed this market for our product.

Evidence of the critical condition the fur-farming industry is in today is substantiated by the fact that a large part of the 1945 crop and all of the 1946 crop is unsold. Besides the cost of production, stored furs depreciate very rapidly. Financial losses to fur farmers are far above any previous year, and our industry is operating on a credit basis.

Something can be done to correct the discrimination in the present excise taxes.

Briefly, here is what is taking place: Section 2401 of the Revenue Act of 1941 reads as follows:

"There is hereby imposed upon the following articles sold at retail a tax equivalent to 10 percent of the price for which so sold; articles made of fur on the hide or pelt, and articles of which such fur is the component material of chief value."

Section 1650 of the Revenue Act increased the rate to 20 percent. Interpretation by the Treasury Department, Office of Internal Revenue, as set forth in their regulation for determining the taxability of fur-trimmed garments is as follows:

"The material components of fur-trimmed garments recognized for tax purposes by the Treasury Department are the fur set, the cloth shell, the lining shell, and the findings. Since the cost of the cloth shell is greater than that of the lining shell or of the findings, the taxability of a fur-trimmed garment will be determined by a comparison of the cost of the fur with the cost of the cloth shell. When the cost of the fur set exceeds the cost of the cloth shell, the garment is taxable, and conversely when the cost of the cloth shell is greater, the garment is not taxable."

In actual practice and operation, here is how it works (the example used represents one of the largest fur trim volume lines on the market today. The cloth used is the finest material obtainable):

#### Manufacturer to consumer

	Fur-trimmed coat	
	Tax-free	Subject to tax
Material value:		
Cloth shell.....	\$20	\$20.00
Lining shell.....	7	7.00
Findings.....	3	3.00
Fur set.....	19	24.00
Cost of materials.....	49	54.00
Labor, overhead, and manufacturers' mark-up.....	41	42.00
Wholesale price paid by retailer.....	90	96.00
Retailers' mark-up, average 33 1/3 percent.....	30	32.00
Retail price paid by consumer.....	120	128.00
Plus 20 percent tax.....		25.60
Price paid by consumer, including tax.....		153.60

Here we have exactly the same cost, except for a \$5 better fur set costing the consumer \$33.60 more. In fact, the tax amounts to more than the cost of the fur set. It is obvious why the consumers are not interested in this article.

But that is not the only discriminatory factor. By reason of the tax differential, the retailer is taking a higher mark-up on untaxable garments, and therefore is not interested in buying or handling taxable merchandise.

The net result of the excise tax on fur-trimmed coats is:

(a) The consumer is paying more for a cheap article.

(b) The Government is collecting little, if any tax.

(c) The fur farmer has no market for a large percent of his product and is being forced to liquidate his business.

The reason something must be done at once is very obvious. Fur-trimmed coats are seasonable articles. Manufacturers are now beginning to make new designs and styles for manufacture during the summer months to go on the market next fall and winter. The matter cannot be left to be corrected by later legislation.

The proposed amendment will correct the situation without any effect on other articles or establishing a precedent or reason for further amendments to the bill.

#### CONTINUATION OF CERTAIN WAR EXCISE TAX RATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BUTLER submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1030) to continue in effect certain war excise tax rates, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF REPORT ON THE SURVIVAL OF A FREE, COMPETITIVE PRESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I am submitting a resolution for which I had intended to ask immediate consideration. However, after discussion with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY], who heads the new Small Business Committee, I ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

The resolution provides for the printing of 5,000 additional copies of the report submitted by the chairman of the



Senate Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], on *Survival of a Free, Competitive Press—The Small Newspaper: Democracy's Grassroots*. The resolution is offered because of the exhaustion of the limited supply of 2,000 provided the committee and the demand for copies coming into my own office and the offices of other Senators.

This report is amongst the last acts performed by the retiring chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee. It is in keeping with the high standard of work he had done on important and timely problems during the 6 years of his leadership on this Senate committee in behalf of independent business. It focuses attention on one of the most serious threats to our domestic prosperity and democratic institutions, the weakening or disappearance of independent newspapers all over the country. As the Senator from Montana well says in the report: "With each disappearance of a competitive local newspaper some vital part of democracy is lost."

The report gives figures showing that a tenth of all our newspapers have gone out of business during the past 15 years and that the crisis in newsprint is reducing to a mere trickle the supply available to small newspapers still in existence.

The Murray report directly concerns every one of our local newspapers. There are some 15,000 of them scattered over this broad country, playing their vital role in the formation of public opinion, disseminating news, assisting in the sale and distribution of goods, and developing civic welfare in their communities. Nothing is more important than that they know the results of this unbiased, carefully prepared report, for much of it is based on an analysis of the very problems they brought to the attention of the chairman.

Speaking for myself—and I am sure for other Senators as well—I wish to place a copy of this invaluable report in the hands of every publisher in my State. No better use could be made of the taxpayers' money than to bring to light the problems now threatening the very life of our American free press as a first step in their solution. This report of the former chairman of the Senate Small Business Committee does just that, and for that reason I urge approval of my resolution for the printing of additional copies.

The report submitted by the Senator from Montana analyzes the newsprint situation as it affects the small newspapers of the country. They are having a worse time now getting newsprint than they had during the period of rationing while the war was in progress. I think it is important that the country know this, and that additional copies of this report be printed. As I have said, the report is indicative of the excellent work done by the former distinguished chairman of the committee. The new chairman, the distinguished Senator from Nebraska, is somewhat familiar with the situation, but I think perhaps the committee should

review the subject in the light of the report. I hope the resolution can be taken up and considered by the Senate on Friday or Monday.

The resolution (S. Res. 80), submitted by Mr. MAGNUSON, was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

*Resolved*, That there be printed 5,000 additional copies of Senate Committee Print No. 17, Eightieth Congress, first session, being the report entitled "Survival of a Free, Competitive Press," which was printed for the use of the Special Committee To Study Problems of American Small Business created pursuant to Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, agreed to October 8, 1940. Such additional copies shall be for the use of the Senate Document Room.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, in view of the statement made by the distinguished Senator from Washington, let me say that I am not objecting, as chairman of the Small Business Committee, to the printing of additional copies of the report. However, because an expenditure is involved, the resolution should be considered by a subcommittee of the Committee on Rules and Administration. I am simply asking that the resolution be referred to the appropriate committee and that that committee consider the resolution. Of course, if the resolution meets with the approval of the committee, additional copies of the report will be printed. Instead of granting unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution, I am merely asking that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I will guarantee, as a member of the committee, that it will be acted upon immediately, and that the committee will decide what to do about the printing of additional copies of the report.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to have it understood that the Senator from Nebraska is objecting to the printing of additional copies of the report. He merely wishes to follow the proper procedure.

#### PRINTING OF CERTAIN DATA RELATING TO FARM PRICE-SUPPORT PROGRAM (S. DOC. NO. 9)

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, on January 23 the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and gave valuable information relative to the Department's farm program for the next 2 years, 1947 and 1948.

A portion of the Secretary's statement was in explanation of the Agriculture Department's program for price supports.

Inasmuch as all farmers are interested in the price-support program it is well to make such information available to them. I have, therefore, selected certain data relative to the Government's farm price-support program and ask unanimous consent that the data thus compiled be printed as a Senate document.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the matter presented by the Senator from Kansas will be printed as a Senate document.

#### DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS BY THE NATIONAL CATHOLIC WELFARE CONFERENCE

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the New York Times of yesterday published the text of the Declaration of Human Rights submitted by the National Catholic Welfare Conference to the United Nations Committee on Human Rights. The statement, I understand, was drafted by a committee comprising bishops, priests, theologians, and laymen chosen by the conference. The statement, according to the New York Times, was intended to give expression on Catholic policy in America for the hierarchy.

The declaration is one of the most integrated and comprehensive, although concise, statements of the principles and objectives of a truly humanistic and democratic program that I have seen in recent years. It should serve as a framework for all progressive-minded people regardless of their religious faith. I congratulate the National Catholic Welfare Conference for its statesmanlike declaration, and I recommend its perusal, especially by all Members of Congress.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the declaration be printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the declaration was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### A DECLARATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

##### GENERAL PREAMBLE

God, the Creator of the human race, has charged man with obligations arising from his personal dignity, from his immortal destiny, and from his relationships as a social being. These obligations are in reference to the Creator, to himself, to his family and fellow men, to the state, and to the community of states. For the fulfillment of these obligations man is endowed with certain natural, inalienable rights. These obligations and rights form the substance of the natural moral law which can be known by reason.

Obligations and rights are correlative. At all times the obligation to respect the rights of others operates against the arbitrary use of rights.

Suitable opportunity to discharge fundamental obligations in the various and separate situations of life is a right which cannot be justly denied. For man's use God has provided the basic resources of this world.

The unity of the human race under God is not broken by geographical distance or by diversity of civilization, culture, and economy, and the adequate use of the world's resources by all peoples is not to be denied because of these factors.

Weakness resulting from conquest or imperfection in governmental organization should not be used as a pretext to reject the fundamental rights of man or to impede their legitimate exercise.

The order of rights outlined below progresses through the individual, the family, the state, and the community of states.

#### PART I. THE RIGHTS OF THE HUMAN PERSON

The dignity of man, created in the image of God, obligates him to live in accordance with law imposed by God. Consequently, he is endowed as an individual and as a member of society with rights which are inalienable.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to life and bodily integrity from the moment of conception, regardless

of physical or mental condition, except in just punishment for crime.

2. The right to serve and worship God in private and in public.

3. The right to religious formation through education and association.

4. The right to personal liberty under just law.

5. The right to the equal protection of just law regardless of sex, nationality, color, or creed.

6. The right to freedom of expression, of information, and of communication in accordance with truth and justice.

7. The right to choose and freely to maintain a state of life, married or single, lay or religious.

8. The right to education suitable for the maintenance and development of man's dignity as a human person.

9. The right to petition the government for redress of grievances.

10. The right to a nationality.

11. The right of access to the means of livelihood by migration when necessary.

12. The right of association and peaceable assembly.

13. The right to work and choose one's occupation.

14. The right to personal ownership, use, and disposal of property subject to the rights of others and to limitations in the interest of the general welfare.

15. The right to a living wage.

16. The right to collective bargaining.

17. The right to associate by industries and professions to obtain economic justice and the general welfare.

18. The right to assistance from society, if necessary from the state, in distress of person or family.

#### PART II. THE RIGHTS PERTAINING TO THE FAMILY

The family is the natural and fundamental group unit of society and is endowed by the Creator with inalienable rights antecedent to all positive law. The family does not exist for the state, but on the other hand is not independent.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to marry, to establish a home and beget children.

2. The right to economic security sufficient for the stability and independence of the family.

3. The right to the protection of maternity.

4. The right to educate the children.

5. The right to maintain, if necessary by public protection and assistance, adequate standards of child welfare within the family circle.

6. The right to assistance, through community services in the education and care of the children.

7. The right to housing adapted to the needs and functions of family life.

8. The right to immunity of the home from search and trespass.

9. The right to protection against immoral conditions in the community.

#### PART III. THE DOMESTIC RIGHTS OF STATES

Political authority is entrusted by God to nations, which are endowed with rights and charged with the obligation of establishing justice, of promoting the general welfare of their citizens, and of cooperating with other nations in furthering the universal welfare of mankind.

It is the right of all peoples that are capable of self-government to organize politically and to function as states upon equal terms with other states.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to enact just laws binding in conscience.

2. The right to establish courts of justice and to enforce the observance of law with adequate sanctions.

3. The right to demand of its citizens respect for the rights of minorities.

4. The rights to tax by adequate and equitable means in order to carry out its proper functions.

5. The right to exercise eminent domain when demanded by the common welfare.

6. The right to require that its people receive an education suitable for citizenship.

7. The right to defend itself against domestic violence.

8. The right to watch over, stimulate, restrain, and order the private activities of individuals and groups in the degree that is necessary for the common good.

9. The right to regulate operations of international economic groups functioning within its own boundaries.

10. The right to adopt in time of emergency special measures necessary for the common good.

#### PART IV. THE RIGHTS OF STATES IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY

The human family constitutes an organic unity or a world society.

The states of the world have the right and the duty to associate and to organize in the international community for their common welfare.

The indispensable foundation of all peaceful intercourse among nations and an essential condition of juridical relations among them are common trust and respect for the plighted word. Treaties and agreements must not be considered subject to arbitrary unilateral repudiation.

Every state has certain fundamental rights in the international community.

Among these rights are:

1. The right to exist as a member of the international community and to be protected in its national life and integrity against acts of aggression by any other state or states.

2. The right to independence in the determination of its own domestic and foreign policies in accordance with the principles of morality, and subject to the obligations of international law.

3. The right to juridical equality with other states in the family of nations.

4. The right to membership in the organized international community and to the benefit of international cooperation.

5. The right to the assistance of the international community in securing the fulfillment of the terms of a just treaty or agreement.

6. The right to obtain from the international community redress of grievances arising from unjust treaties imposed by force.

7. The right to the revision of treaties which are no longer in accord with fundamental justice.

8. The right to recourse to the procedures of pacific settlement established by the international community for disputes which diplomatic negotiations have failed to settle.

9. The right to maintain political, economic, and social intercourse with other States upon equal terms.

10. The right of access, upon equal terms, to the markets and raw materials of the world necessary for its own life as a people.

11. The right to protect its own natural resources and economic life from unjust exploitation.

12. The right to the assistance of the international community in time of economic or social distress.

13. The right to grant asylum to refugees from injustice.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR LUCAS ON PROPOSED REDUCTION OF TAXES

[Mr. McMAHON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "Can Taxes Be Reduced?" delivered by Senator Lucas on January 31, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### A CHALLENGE TO THE STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE—ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR McCORD, OF TENNESSEE

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Challenge to the State Employment Service," delivered by Hon. Jim McCord, Governor of Tennessee, at the Governors' Conference, Miami, Fla., December 6, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AND NATIONAL REPUTATION—ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM BENTON

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "National Defense and National Reputation," delivered by Hon. William Benton, Assistant Secretary of State, before the Twenty-first Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense, at Washington, D. C., January 25, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ARKANSAS STATE SYMPHONY ORCHESTRA

[Mr. FULBRIGHT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Founding a State Orchestra," published in the Musical Courier, December 1946 issue, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### REPORT ON THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL FOR 1946

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a report on the Thomas Jefferson Memorial for 1946, prepared by A. E. Demaray, director and executive agent for the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### LABOR PROBLEMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK POST

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "From Truce to Peace," published in the New York Post of January 29, 1947, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROPAGANDA BUDGET OF NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MANUFACTURERS

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article, NAM Plans \$4,700,000 Fund for Propaganda in 1947, appearing in the Farmers Union Herald of South St. Paul, Minn., of January 17, 1946, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### DEMOCRATIC PARTY HOPE—LETTER PUBLISHED IN WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter published in the Washington Post of February 5, 1947, under the heading "Democratic Party hope," which appears in the Appendix.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The routine morning business is concluded.

#### REPORT OF PRESIDENT ON ACTIVITIES OF UNITED NATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(For President's message, see today's proceedings of the House of Representatives on p. 803.)

#### PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which



was read and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,  
Washington, February 5, 1947.  
HON. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,  
President of the Senate pro tempore,  
United States Senate, Washington,  
D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On June 19, 1945, I sent a message to the Congress of the United States suggesting that the Congress should give its consideration to the question of the Presidential succession.

In that message, it was pointed out that under the existing statute governing the succession to the office of President, members of the Cabinet successively fill the office in the event of the death of the elected President and Vice President. It was further pointed out that, in effect, the present law gives to me the power to nominate my immediate successor in the event of my own death or inability to act.

I said then, and I repeat now, that in a democracy, this power should not rest with the Chief Executive. I believe that, insofar as possible, the office of the President should be filled by an elective officer.

In the message of June 19, 1945, I recommended that the Congress enact legislation placing the Speaker of the House of Representatives first in order of succession, and if there were no Speaker, or if he failed to qualify, that the President pro tempore of the Senate should act until a duly qualified Speaker was elected.

A bill (H. R. 3587) providing for this succession was introduced in the House of Representatives and was passed by the House on June 29, 1945. It failed, however, to pass the Senate.

The same need, for a revision of the law of succession, that existed when I sent the message to the Congress on June 19, 1945, still exists today.

I see no reason to change or amend the suggestion which I previously made to the Congress, but if the Congress is not disposed to pass the type of bill previously passed by the House, then I recommend that some other plan of succession be devised so that the office of the President would be filled by an officer who holds his position as a result of the expression of the will of the voters of this country.

It is my belief that the present line of succession as provided by the existing statute, which was enacted in 1886, is not in accord with our basic concept of government by elected representatives of the people.

I again urge the Congress to give its attention to this subject.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

#### NOMINATIONS TO THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Atomic Energy Commission is so important that not only the American Government's very existence as a nation but that of the American people as individuals depends upon the secret and careful use and unhampered American development of atomic energy. It is vital, therefore, that those appointed as members of the Commission be the safest, wisest, and most genuine Americans in the Nation, wholly unaffected with any foreign likes or dislikes, and uninfluenced by any sympathy for any foreign government or foreign ideas or ideals. I firmly urge that if any Senator, certainly any member of the committee who has heard the evidence in the case, has any doubt regarding the fitness of any individual appointed to the Commis-

sion, and objects to his appointment, then the person so appointed must not be confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. President, the appointments to membership on this Commission are probably the most important that have come to the Senate of the United States at any time in its history. If Senators have a doubt as to the Americanism or the good faith or the sincerity or patriotism of anyone appointed to be a member of the Commission, he should not be confirmed.

I should like to have Senators give these thoughts most careful consideration in deliberating on the membership of this Commission.

It seems to me that every Senator ought to realize that involved in this matter is a fight between Russian communism on one side and pure, unadulterated Americanism on the other. Those who believe in Russian communism over pure Americanism will no doubt vote for these nominees. Those of us who believe that any of these nominees are tainted with communism will vote against the confirmation of such nominees.

#### REVENUE ESTIMATES UNDER TAX-REDUCTION PROPOSALS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, in view of the fact that tax reduction may become an issue at this session of the Congress, I have requested Mr. Stam, chief of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue, to furnish certain information, and I ask that his letter may be printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate.

I invite attention to the following information contained in the letter:

In accordance with your recent request, I am submitting the following revenue estimates as to various tax plans:

Increase per capita exemptions from \$500 to \$600.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 2,917,000.

Loss in revenue, \$1,500,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from \$500 to \$700.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,860,000.

Loss in revenue, \$3,000,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from \$500 to \$800.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 10,000,000.

Loss in revenue, \$3,900,000,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Married persons from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Single persons from \$500 to \$1,000.

Leave dependency credit at \$500.

Loss in revenue, \$5,022,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from the rolls, 18,319,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Single persons, \$750.

Married persons, \$750.

Dependents, \$375.

Loss in revenue, \$3,084,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,000,000.

Mr. President, it may be recalled that at the time of the passage of the 1945 act, which actually occurred early in 1946, there were on the rolls more than 50,000,000 taxpayers. Twelve million were removed from the rolls by that act. At the present time the number of taxpayers on the rolls is roughly 45,000,000. So if any one of the methods discussed by

Mr. Stam in his letter should be used, it is easy to see to what extent the tax base would be narrowed.

I ask unanimous consent to have the entire letter printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, JOINT COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL REVENUE TAXATION, Washington, January 29, 1947.

HON. WALTER F. GEORGE,  
United States Senate,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GEORGE: In accordance with your recent request, I am submitting the following revenue estimates as to various tax plans:

Increase per capita exemptions from \$500 to \$600.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 2,917,000.

Loss in revenue, \$1,500,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from \$500 to \$700.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,860,000.

Loss in revenue, \$3,000,000,000.

Increase per capita exemption from \$500 to \$800.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 10,000,000.

Loss in revenue, \$3,900,000,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Married persons from \$1,000 to \$2,000.

Single persons from \$500 to \$1,000.

Leave dependency credit at \$500.

Loss in revenue, \$5,022,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from the rolls, 18,319,000.

Increase exemptions as follows:

Single persons, \$750.

Married persons, \$750.

Dependents, \$375.

Loss in revenue, \$3,084,000,000.

Number of taxpayers removed from rolls, 9,000,000.

Aside from the revenue problems involved, any change from the per capita system would necessarily complicate the forms, instructions, and the withholding tables. With the continuation of a broad base, which is now around 45,000,000 taxpayers, it is necessary that the tax computations be made simple, and, under the present law, the taxes of the wage earners in the lower groups are computed by the collector. Under any new system, the collector would be required to check the exemption values to see whether proper values were assigned single persons, married persons, or dependents. Additional computations would also be required of the taxpayer with greater possibility of error. Now, that the taxpayer has become familiar with the per capita system, and the system in the collectors' offices is now geared to that system, it would cause added confusion to change over to another system.

Respectfully yours,

COLIN F. STAM,  
Chief of Staff.

#### THE CLOSED SHOP—EDITORIAL FROM MEDFORD (OREG.) MAIL-TRIBUNE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks—because I wish to be associated with the contents of the editorial—an editorial entitled "More About the Closed Shop" published in the Medford (Oreg.) Mail-Tribune of January 29, 1947. The editorial is written by a distinguished editor, Robert W. Ruhl.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## MORE ABOUT THE CLOSED SHOP

In a very long and thoughtful editorial regarding the closed shop the Portland Oregonian concludes, among other things, that it cannot—we quote:

"With good moral or political conscience endorse the principle of the closed shop, for it believes that the right to work is at least as sacred as the right to strike \* \* \*. The closed shop is morally incompatible with a system of government which guarantees the freedom of the individual."

Well, that is a pretty strong argument against the closed shop, and from the standpoint of theory might be termed quite convincing.

But just what does it add up to from a practical, coldly realistic standpoint?

Is it really true, for example, that, under conditions as they exist today, the right of the individual to work is denied by the closed shop? We think not.

He can't work in a closed shop unless he joins the union. But he can work in an open shop. And according to the latest statistics, there is not a trade in existence which is 100 percent unionized.

So that statement that the right of work is denied is not factually correct.

As long as there are "closed" and "open" shops operating in this country—as long as the former is not mandatory and the latter not prohibited—it can't truthfully be said an individual has to join a union to get work.

There are over 50,000,000 workers in the United States today, and almost all of them are now employed. Yet only a comparatively small percentage belong to unions. Which means literally millions of nonunion men and women must be gainfully employed today.

That is the situation as it actually exists.

We don't deny labor leaders want all the workers and shops unionized, and are striving toward that end. But until that is accomplished it can't be claimed the sacred right to work for those who wish to work is denied. It may be harder for a nonunion worker to get work, but it certainly is not impossible.

Now as to the freedom of the individual.

Let us suppose, for the sake of argument, John Doe takes a job and buys a suburban lot at the same time. For the latter he gives money; for the former, skill and training.

Soon after he takes the job he is asked to join the union and pay dues; and about the same time his suburban lot is taken into the city, and he is asked to pay city taxes and perhaps certain special assessments for improvements.

There is no doubt of this.

The union has raised the standards of labor immeasurably, the benefits that labor enjoys, and therefore the value of the job John Doe has taken.

There is also no doubt the improvements involved in becoming a part of the city—sewer, paving, lights, fire and police protection, etc.—have greatly increased the value of John's suburban property.

But let us assume further that John Doe doesn't like either idea.

He is, let us say, a rugged individualist. He wants to preserve his sacred freedom both as far as joining a union and paying city taxes are concerned. Why should he be forced to join a union and pay union dues if he doesn't wish to? Why, by the same token, should he be forced to become a city resident and pay city taxes, if he doesn't wish to?

Well, the answer in both instances is he can't be.

No city can force a property owner to pay taxes, no union can force a worker to join a union and pay dues.

But in both instances John can't have his cake and eat it, too. He can't enjoy the benefits of union membership, nor the benefits of a city residence unless he shares the expenses and responsibilities of them.

If he wants neither, then he will have to find a place to work outside of a union and a place to live—or hold property—outside of a city.

We are not trying, however, to uphold the "closed shop" on principle. We are merely trying to give a picture of this problem as we see it today rather than as it is so often portrayed by those who oppose it.

As far as the Mail-Tribune is concerned—as has been stated before—we are against both prohibition and compulsion as far as the closed shop is concerned. When labor and management want a closed shop we believe there should be no law preventing it. And when they both want an open shop there should be no law preventing that.

Until some system of labor courts are established there should be no compulsory or prohibitory labor laws whatever.

Labor and management should be entirely free to bargain as they wish and select any system of shop control they may consider mutually satisfactory.

When, however, in a vital industry where the welfare of the country becomes involved, just what management or just what labor prefers should not then we believe be the first consideration.

The first consideration should be the public welfare, and maintaining it.

And there should be some authority—we don't care, precisely how it might be organized or what it might be called—but some authority which could step in when the two interested parties cannot agree, and a tie-up is threatened, and tell both sides what to do, so that the vital industry may continue to function and the people of the country need not suffer.

R. W. R.

#### ACTIVITIES OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—EDITORIAL FROM NEW YORK TIMES

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "Witch Hunt or Inquiry?" published in the New York Times of February 3, 1947. The editorial deals with the activities of the Senate Special Committee To Investigate the National Defense Program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WITCH HUNT OR INQUIRY?

The Senate War Investigating Committee, reconstituted by an almost solid party vote, is settling down for what promises to be a prolonged inquiry into excessive profits, fraud, corruption, waste, extravagance, mismanagement, incompetence, and inefficiency, in the home-front conduct of the Second World War. Its first session, in Washington on Friday, emphasized its partisan character. Its Republican majority on that day met and heard the first witness nearly an hour before floor leader BARKLEY, according to his own statement, knew "who was going to compose the minority membership of the committee." There was an explanation. The witness in question, Brig. Gen. Maurice Hirsch, Chairman of the War Contracts Price Adjustment Board, was in a hurry. He was retiring from the Army Friday night and going on a honeymoon trip. Still, this was not an auspicious beginning for an inquiry which can be of value only if it is judicial.

The Republican majority did not go out of its way even to seem judicial. If it had followed the spirit, if not the letter, of the Congressional Reorganization Act, it would have referred the investigation to the regular Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. Senator AIKEN, of Vermont, chairman of this committee, voted with three

other Republicans that this be done. But Senator AIKEN is apparently under suspicion as being almost too judicial. Senator BREWSTER, of Maine, who seems not to be similarly suspect, is the chairman of the special committee.

The Democrats may be pardoned if they fear that this investigation has some connection with next year's Presidential campaign. It will have such a connection, no matter what happens. But if the Republicans wish to make political capital with fair-minded people they will not go on a witch hunt; they will conduct a scrupulously fair-minded inquiry.

#### DISPLACED PERSONS—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial entitled "DP's," published in the Washington Post of February 4, 1947. I urge Members of the Senate to read the editorial. It very largely confirms my own observations during the months of November and December of a number of DP camps in Germany.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### DP'S

Secretary Marshall has told the Jewish Labor Committee that he has a special concern for the million displaced persons in the western zones of Germany. It is no reflection upon our new Secretary of State to say that these people have been almost buried in such sentiments. Action has become the only test of special concern. By the end of June UNRRA will be withdrawn from the job of supervising the DP camps. In its place there will be the new International Refugee Organization set up 3 months ago by the United Nations Assembly. But the task of getting the IRO under way is proceeding at a snail's pace. Even Great Britain, which has been in the van in championing the cause of the refugee, has not yet seen fit to sign the IRO constitution. To be sure, there are enough signers to enable the United Nations to set up an interim organization, but the laggardliness of some of the nations does not augur well for the success of the undertaking.

The displaced persons in Germany are of all nationalities, including even American. In numerical strength the Balts and the Poles are first and second, respectively. The Jews, with almost 200,000, are third. A misconception to which Secretary Marshall unwittingly lent countenance when he expressed his special concern to the Jewish Labor Committee is that the DP's are all Jews. The only common denominator among them is their objection to life under totalitarian rule, Fascist or Communist. All they ask is that they may be permitted to start life anew in a free country. It was out of this material that the New World was created. Surely this love of freedom should warm our hearts to these unfortunate folk.

It is untrue to suggest that they all want to come to America. None of the Jews have any such desire. They all want to go to Palestine, and 100,000 of them could have been accommodated if the British had accepted, without the fatal equivocation that encouraged the Arabs, the recommendation of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine set up at the instance of the British Government. The others are ready to go anywhere except to despot lands.

It is a sign of moral decline that the conscience that these people display is regarded with suspicion. The fear is that maybe they would turn out to be agitators. No investigation warrants any feeling that agitation is their stock in trade. The fact is that in



these displaced camps all the skills and crafts in the calendar are represented. If a new country wants doctors and dentists, it will find them among these folk. If an old country is lacking farm workers and miners, the camps are a source of supply. And they are all eager to work. If, of course, they are left idle for too long a period, they may turn out to be unemployable, though we doubt this in the case of these sturdy and independent people, for the camps (as we have seen for ourselves) are run by the DP's themselves, and the first rule is that no drones are tolerated. It is one of the ironies of the times that Britain and other countries of western Europe are complaining of a labor shortage when there is this reservoir of labor at hand in the DP camps.

The special concern of the United States should be expressed in action in conformity with our traditions and our necessities. This is still the land of the free, where men have built a great country on the ideals that these DP's cherish. This land of ours is short of certain types of labor. Nobody asks that we abolish our restrictions on immigration in helping to solve the DP problem. But we could so adjust the quotas as to see they are all used up and that refugees are included. The existing law would permit an annual immigration of 153,879, yet we are now receiving quota immigrants at the rate of about 80,000 a year. The President has indicated his wholehearted support of such an adjustment as would enable us to give hospitality to 39,000 refugees a year. But only a sixth of that number had been received in the year just ended. It would be a demonstration of our special concern if we stopped viewing the refugee problem as merely an abstraction in a vacuum and eased the way for at least the handful that the President had in mind.

#### NATIONAL HOUSING AGENCY—NOMINATION OF DILLON S. MYER

Mr. PEPPER obtained the floor.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRICKER in the chair). The Senator will state it.

Mr. WHERRY. Has the morning business been concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The morning business has been concluded.

Mr. WHERRY. And has the Senator from Florida been recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida was recognized and yielded to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Banking and Currency I report favorably the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency. The nomination was favorably reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency yesterday. In view of the delay which has occurred with respect to this nomination I now ask unanimous consent that the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority be immediately considered, and the nomination confirmed forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, as I understand, this nomination had previously been placed on the calendar, and had then been recommitted to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TOBEY. I will explain the matter if the Senator will permit.

Mr. WHERRY. Reserving the right to object, I ask for an explanation.

Mr. TOBEY. The nomination of Mr. Dillon S. Myer was submitted by the President 2 weeks ago or more. It came to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, which considered the nomination, after having held a hearing on it for an hour and a half. Then on motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] the nomination was reported unanimously by the committee.

Subsequent thereto some gentlemen appeared at the office of the Senator from Indiana and told him they wanted to object to the nomination and to present certain charges to the committee. He brought them to my office. They spent an hour and a half with me a week ago Saturday. They asked for an opportunity to appear before the committee and give their evidence as to the nomination of Mr. Myer. Yesterday was the day on which they were to appear before the committee. Before the committee convened they withdrew their opposition and did not appear. There was no testimony presented in opposition to Mr. Myer. Two committee members, however, voted against reporting his nomination favorably. Eight committee members voted to report the nomination favorably.

Mr. President, in view of the delay in making the appointment and in view of the fact that Mr. Myer's nomination was overwhelmingly voted out of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, and in justice to him, I ask unanimous consent that his nomination be considered immediately and that he be confirmed forthwith, instead of the nomination having to go to the calendar and action upon it wait until Friday next when I cannot be present.

I renew my request for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. WHERRY. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

#### TREND OF FOREIGN POLICY UNDER REPUBLICAN AUSPICES

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, upon the very eve of the all-important Foreign Ministers' Conference at Moscow, to determine the future of Germany and therefore, in the light of history, the future of war in the world, we have from Mr. John Foster Dulles, famed Republican adviser on foreign policy, speaking to the National Publishers' Association

on the 17th day of January past, the latest declaration of Republican policy on Germany and the forces making for peace or war.

I rise to discuss this important pronouncement of Republican foreign policy by Mr. Dulles not in the mechanical terms of a soft peace or a hard peace for Germany. My concern is a just peace, and a lasting peace, a peace that will insure that the next generation of Americans will not have to slog through the muddy fields of another Flanders, as did their grandfathers in 1918, or dive into the same foxholes in Normandy which sheltered their fathers in 1944.

It is then from the standpoint of a just and lasting peace that I must take issue with this new proposal of Mr. Dulles, which so clearly and unmistakably would smash the terms of the Potsdam agreement and replace it with the dangerous and discredited doctrine of a western bloc and the rebuilding of a powerful Germany.

This statement from Mr. Dulles comes on the heels of a series of declarations by Republican leaders on the political and economic aspects of our foreign policy. The able Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, speaking recently at Cleveland, ignored the announced recommendation of General Marshall and threw his full weight, without qualification or reservation, behind the Chinese faction which General Marshall had found corrupt, incompetent, and, in a large measure, anti-democratic.

In the same Cleveland address the Senator from Michigan would have us lead our sister American Republics into a common hemispheric defense pact with Argentina, in the face of the stern declaration by the then Secretary of State, Hon. James F. Byrnes, that Argentina had not purged itself of its fifth column of Nazis or its Nazi confederates.

Within the past few weeks leading Republican House Members have introduced legislation to suspend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act; and on this floor the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] has denounced the Trade Agreements Act as a gigantic hoax, provoking the New York Times to inquire in a recent editorial, "Which way for Republicans?"

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at the end of my remarks the editorial referred to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator from Nebraska said that he spoke for himself, but at the same time, according to the press, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and other leading Republicans advised the Under Secretary of State, Mr. William L. Clayton—and I quote their words—"not to go too far"; that is, not to exercise his full authority under the Trade Agreements Act.

During the past week, Republican Senators HICKENLOOPER, KNOWLAND, and

VANDENBERG insisted, in hearings on the confirmation of the Atomic Energy Commissioners, that the military be allowed to sit in on every session of the Commission in such a way that it would virtually become an integral part of the Commission. Their insistence suggests the reversal of the decision duly made by the President and the Congress that, true to the traditions of our Government, the civil authority shall always be superior to the military. Such suggestions moved the Washington Post, in a recent editorial, to say:

It is an issue which ought never to have arisen in a free society. The very consideration of it suggests a condition of panic. For the subordination of the military to civil authority is the cornerstone of the concept of government by consent.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Post editorial referred to be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. PEPPER. So now, in the short space of a few weeks, in a series of declarations supporting reaction in China and Argentina, trying to reverse our trade-agreements program for international economic collaboration, and repudiating Potsdam, the Republican Party has emerged from the cloak of a bipartisan foreign policy and is causing more and more concern to people who ask whether it is the same Republican Party with the same policy which undermined the foundations of peace and prosperity after the First World War.

Mr. Dulles, its chief spokesman, speaking on the 25th of January to a Republican women's organization, has served notice on the people of the United States and of the world in unmistakable words that the only bipartisan foreign policy his party will agree to must be their policy. I quote from his address, as reported in the New York Herald Tribune of Sunday, January 26, 1947:

A Democratic President and his Secretary of State can propose, but a Republican Congress can dispose. Foreign diplomats know that, and they suspect what we know—that 2 years from now, a Republican will be in the White House. So these foreign governments will not take very seriously American proposals which are backed only by the Democratic Party.

Like many other Americans, I have sensed a steady and growing Republican pressure to force our foreign policy away from the policy of firm international collaboration for peace so carefully built by President Roosevelt. At times I have felt that the administration has been called upon to pay too high a price, under those circumstances, for bipartisanship in our foreign policy.

But now, in his speech of January 17, which goes to the very core of the peace problem, the chief Republican spokesman on foreign policy, Mr. Dulles, so completely ignores the Potsdam agreement, solemnly entered into by this Government, and all that has been done under it, including territorial changes and the moving of millions of people from or to distant homes, that I wonder if he is meaning to suggest not only that the Re-

publican Party will be decisive in all future agreements entered into by this Government but also that any agreements entered into in the past without Republican representation are not to be regarded by the world as binding. Surely those powers which have been concerned that the United States has already been whitening away at the integrity of the Potsdam agreement, solemnly entered into by our Government, will not have their confidence in the integrity of the Potsdam agreement enhanced by any such declaration on the part of so eminent a Republican spokesman as Mr. Dulles, especially when he presumes to speak with the authority of both the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate and the titular head of the Republican Party. For in his address Mr. Dulles declared that he had cleared his speech with the Senator from Michigan and Governor Dewey.

In order to understand clearly how far Mr. Dulles and the Republican Party propose to thrust this Nation and the world along a new path in foreign policy by subverting the Potsdam agreement—and lest it be obscured by those cunning interpreters who seek to obliterate great differences by small words—let us examine what Britain, the Soviet Union, and the United States sought to accomplish at Potsdam. It was the industrial and military disarmament of Germany, the sterilization of Germany as a war-making power which they sought at Potsdam. The problem the Allies faced at Potsdam and the importance of the solution were brilliantly formulated by America's distinguished elder statesman, Mr. Bernard Baruch, in his testimony before the Senate Military Affairs Committee:

No more important question ever will come before you than this one—of how to prevent the revival of Germany's war-making might. It is the heart of the making of the peace; it is the heart of the keeping of the peace. What is done with Germany holds the key to whether Russia, Britain, and the United States can continue to get along. It will affect profoundly the jobs and livelihoods of everyone, everywhere, for none of the economic problems of the peace can be solved except in the light of German reparations policy and the measures taken to demilitarize Germany's traditional war economy.

It was against the Prussian-dominated, conquest-mad, inhumanly savage Germany, which had made criminal war upon France three times and upon Europe and the world twice in 70 years, that the agreement was drawn at Potsdam in the summer of 1945, by the nations that had borne the anguish of Germany's two wars of conquest in a quarter of a century. Churchill, Attlee, Stalin, Roosevelt, Truman, Byrnes, Marshall, Harriman, and many more helped fashion the instrument to remove the claws from this war maker.

The Potsdam agreement, hailed throughout the world not as the savage, but as the solemn, resolve of her victims at long last to stop Germany's war making, strove relentlessly to cut out the very war-making organs from the German body. It provided for the prosecution of German war criminals of all kinds; for getting the Nazis out of any sphere of leadership in German life; for the eradication of Germany's military machine,

including the general staff; for the industrial disarmament of Germany by the removal of the industrial equipment with which Germany prepared for and waged war, and such tight control over the German economy that while it would produce for the German people a standard of living equal to the average of European nations it would provide no margin for war making. Under the agreement, a dual purpose was served in the detachment from Germany of a portion of her eastern territory, namely, the partial compensation of Poland for territory awarded to the Soviet Union in line with the Curzon Commission award, and putting Polish and Soviet power in those areas, notably Prussia, where in the past German offensives have been conceived, mounted, and launched.

Potsdam did not destroy the German Nation or the German people, nor did it condemn the German people to poverty. On the contrary, let me repeat that it allowed the German people a level of living equal to the average living level of their neighbors in Europe. It contemplated that they could and would enjoy the blessings of democratic government and continued unity as a nation and people. But, if carried out, Potsdam did mean that Germany would never again be able to wage war upon the world, and Potsdam did mean that Germany should continue to be the common concern of those nations who had been her major victims, and not the shameless ally of any of her victims against the others in any future plans or any future war. I declare that nothing has been said by President Truman or Secretary Byrnes or, so far as I know, until Mr. Dulles spoke, by any American representative for foreign affairs which has altered this basic concept of our duty to American dead who lie all over the world today, victims of criminal German wars.

The architects of Potsdam knew the German and the European economies. They knew that Germany's war weapons were forged in the German industrial areas of the Ruhr and the Rhineland, and that in this area lay not only the threat of another war but the cruel mastery of the whole European economic system as well. Rather than rely upon the cooperation of many hands to restrain a new German giant in the future, the men at Potsdam wisely chose to keep Germany from becoming a giant again. In short, they proposed by the removal of industrial equipment from the Ruhr and the Rhineland, along with the alienation of the industrial area of Upper Silesia, to shear the hair of the German industrial Samson and to keep it shorn. German war-making plants were to be removed to countries in western and eastern Europe which had been the victims of the German war, as partial reparations for the devastation wrought.

Now Mr. Dulles, making a major foreign-policy speech dealing with the future of Germany—a speech which he says has the approval of Senator VANDENBERG and Governor Dewey—upon the very eve of the Moscow Conference of Foreign Ministers, turns his back upon the Potsdam agreement. What does Mr. Dulles propose in its place?



First. He proposes that the Rhineland and the Ruhr, with their vast industrial resources, shall not be industrially disarmed, but that instead their power be revived—a power whose only justification in the past was warfare, military and economic.

Second, Mr. Dulles proposes that this revived industrial heart of Europe be integrated in some unspecified fashion into the economy of three western European countries—France, Belgium, and Holland.

Third. He proposes a federal form of government for Germany.

Using the loose analogy of the American form of government, Mr. Dulles says that—

Such precedents suggest that it is not beyond human resourcefulness to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe, including Germany.

I deliberately emphasize the last words, for these are the heart of his proposals.

Mr. Dulles obviously proposes to nullify the spirit and letter of the Potsdam agreement. His proposals would restore to Germany the power to wage war upon the United States and the world and to dominate the economies of western and eastern Europe, all of necessity, of course, with American capital. They would continue the rule of cartels in world trade; they would create a blood clot in the arteries of the United Nations by setting up a western bloc based upon a restored Germany and directed against the assumed threat of eastern Europe. Here is a blind repetition of the criminal folly committed after the last war, when Germany was rearmed, allegedly against eastern Europe; but in fact a monster was created, destined to devour tens of millions of men, women, and children of the world, including half a million Americans.

To see more clearly the threat to the peace of the United States and of the world contained in Mr. Dulles' proposal to rearm Germany industrially and to create a western bloc, let us go back to the tragic era between the last two wars. France, bled and battered by two German invasions in 44 years, protested to the limit of her ability against adding strength to a Germany which, though defeated, emerged from World War I potentially the strongest nation in Europe. But the powers did not heed France's entreaty. Ostensibly frightened by the bogey of the new Soviet Union, the powers, step by step, restored and rearmed Germany; yes, they even armed Hitler.

Mr. Dulles himself, in his book, *War, Peace, and Change*, published in 1939, justifies this policy. Said he:

Far from being sacred, it would be iniquitous, even if it were practicable, to put shackles on the dynamic peoples (the new Fascist regimes) and condemn them forever to acceptance of conditions which might become intolerable.

Even as late as 1939, Mr. Dulles could not see a rearmed, Nazi, Hitler-led Germany as any threat to us, for he said:

Only hysteria entertains the idea that Germany, Italy, or Japan contemplates war upon us.

To build her war weapons, with which she nearly conquered the world, Germany had steadily altered and expanded her economy until nearly 50 percent of it was directly devoted to war-making purposes. In building up that economy, she had designedly, but deviously, come to dominate the trade of the nations of Europe. It was this German economy, organized and expanded as it was, which was the real war-making power of Germany. Its coming to fruition was the death sentence, Mr. President, to 50,000,000 men, women, and children, including nearly half a million Americans, in the space of 6 years.

It was the unspeakable crime which this Germany perpetrated upon mankind which moved Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, testifying before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs on June 22, 1945, to warn:

Economically, this settlement (referring to the peace settlement) must break once and for all Germany's dominance of Europe. Her war-making potential must be eliminated; many of her plants and factories shifted east and west to friendly countries; all other heavy industry destroyed; the Junkers estates broken up; her exports and imports strictly controlled; German assets and business organizations all over the world routed out.

Those who studied Germany, after the end of the war, discovered that all the damage inflicted upon Germany during the war had not destroyed her war-making power. In December 1945, the Foreign Economic Administration of our Government stated:

Although today Germany is militarily defeated, and its economic life is temporarily at a standstill, the industrial base of its aggression—the base which it built up over the last 25 years, and which enabled it nearly to conquer the world—is virtually untouched. With industrial capacity, technological and scientific organization, and economic assets owned outside Germany, and an integrated control of a highly centralized economy, Germany is still a potential threat to the safety of the world.

It is known that neither the German people nor the German economy suffered so much in the war as did their victim neighbors in Europe. In fact, it was a calculated part of Hitler's sinister strategy that if Germany should lose the war, it would still win it by emerging stronger than its neighbors whom he, with fiendish design and efficiency, murdered, tortured, diseased, starved, and plundered. Five million Jews alone in Europe he butchered. Generations cannot repair the strength of the peoples of Europe which he sapped, and for decades Europe will suffer from the economic debility and chaos into which he thrust it.

Perhaps the peace of the world would better be served if the newspapers were to publish each day a small box on their front pages showing the diets and standards of living of the countries of Europe. Let me read you from a New York Times story of Monday last, headed, "World Food Survey Shows Where Aid Still Is Needed. War's Hunger Aftermath Hitting Hardest at China, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Poland, Yugoslavia. End of UNRRAa Blow." The story is a round-up from New York Times correspondents all over the world. The story from Belgium is headed "Belgium's status good"—and

points out that the basic ration in Belgium provides 1,503 calories. The story from Germany, on the other hand, is headed, "Germans pull in belts"—and what is the basic ration in Germany? It is higher than the basic ration in Belgium—1,550 daily calory ration—and the authorities are planning to raise it to 1,800 calories. So powerful is the reactionary propaganda today looking to the rebuilding of Germany that the higher rations of the aggressor are bewailed, while the lower rations of the nation she overran are considered good. I had not expected to see international policy based on the maudlin sentiment of those who weep over the sad plight of the convicted criminal while ignoring the victims he maimed or killed.

To realize the full force of Mr. Dulles' proposals to rebuild Germany, let us contrast them for a moment with Mr. Baruch's advice on the eve of Potsdam:

Mr. Baruch says: "Economically, this [German] settlement must break once and for all Germany's domination of Europe." But Mr. Dulles would restore Germany's domination of Europe.

Mr. Baruch warns: "[Germany's] war-making potential must be eliminated." But Mr. Dulles would rebuild that war-making potential.

Mr. Baruch says the method of disarming must be removal—"Many of [Germany's] plants and factories shifted east and west to friendly countries." But Mr. Dulles would halt the transfer of German plants and factories—few would go to the west, and none to the east.

Mr. Baruch says, "All other [German] heavy industry must be destroyed." But Mr. Dulles would keep German heavy industry working at high levels. He would destroy none of the heavy industries that provide the sinews of war, and would even rebuild those that are destroyed or damaged.

Now this proposal of Mr. Dulles is not basically new, although it wears a new guise. It is the dangerous doctrine of all those who have been seeking for almost 30 years to pit west against east, to use Germany as the industrial and military wedge to split the world in two. It was the doctrine that motivated the loan of billions of dollars for rebuilding Germany after World War I. It is the doctrine which animated Tory appeasement of Germany under Baldwin and Chamberlain. It was the doctrine that brought the closest collaboration of British, French, and American monopolists with their German counterparts. And it was the doctrine of Churchill's Fulton, Mo., speech, which the American people generally repudiated. It is a doctrine not of the millions of American voters who supported the Republican Party but rather of a handful of American monopolists, bankers, and bankers-generals, who have dominated its policies since the War Between the States.

Mr. Dulles knows that his proposal would nullify the spirit and purpose of the Potsdam agreement. He knows that the restoration of the industrial strength of the Ruhr and the Rhineland under German ownership in alliance with a western bloc will deprive the nations in other parts of Europe of the benefits of German production; will keep the econ-

omies of other nations in Europe hobbled in relation to Germany; will keep eastern Europe, which needs industrialization more than any other part of Europe, a continued prey to German domination; will retain Germany's economic mastery over Europe; will lead, of necessity, to demand for American capital to restore the industrial capacity he envisages; will lead inevitably to new cartel agreements to fit Germany into world trade; and, finally, that it means that Germany is again prepared for war, not only upon eastern Europe, but upon western Europe, the United States, and the world.

Mr. Dulles knows that his plan is designed to ally a reborn Germany with the west of Europe against the east of Europe. He knows the effect of such a proposal is permanently to divide the wartime allies, to give provocation to those forces in east and west who are already disposed to distrust each other.

Mr. Dulles knows that what has moved him in drawing his plan is his hatred for the Soviet Union and that, in the hope that Germany would use it again against eastern Europe and especially the Soviet Union, he has been willing to propose to put in Germany's hands another sword like unto that with which she was armed by the short-sighted such a few years ago and with which she has drawn rivers of blood from suffering mankind not only in the Soviet Union but in America and over the world.

I declare, Mr. President, that Mr. Dulles by proposing to rearm Germany for any reason threatens war to his own country and his own kind. He is opening again the shameless doors of another Munich leading to what will be the world's worst war.

It must be a matter of great concern not only to the powers of eastern Europe and the Balkans, but no less to France, Belgium, and Holland, as well as the United Kingdom and the Scandinavian countries, to hear Mr. Dulles' proposal for the restoration of Germany's industrial war-making power. Let me emphasize that France does not propose control of the Rhineland exclusively by the Western powers. Those nations, I believe, have learned from sad experience—which in some cases has brought back to them the harvest of their own tragic errors—a lesson Mr. Dulles appears not to have learned, namely, that Germany, by history written in blood, is public enemy No. 1 among the nations and peoples of the world.

I say such a proposal coming from Mr. Dulles must be of great concern to all the nations of Europe because of Mr. Dulles' known position and his announcement that he speaks with the approval of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the titular head of the Republican Party, dominant in the American Congress.

I will not anticipate what will be the influence of Mr. Dulles' declaration, so authenticated, upon the course of Secretary Marshall at Moscow.

For my part, I can only hope and believe that Secretary Marshall—having personally fought German militarism in two wars, and knowing the price of both

victories, having been at Potsdam and being sustained by the President, and by the people of this country who fight and pay the price of wars—will go on in the spirit of Potsdam, and, before God and mankind, solemnly covenant and cooperate with all peace-loving nations to save the world from another war.

I believe and hope:

That we shall speed up the prosecution of war criminals in Germany, whether militarists, industrialists, or officials;

That we shall continue the purge of Nazis from all leadership in German life;

That we shall stamp out all forms of militarism in Germany, and particularly the devilish German staff, which has thrice fomented German war;

That we shall effectively disarm Germany industrially so that she shall not have the power to wage war, removing as reparations for the countries which suffered from German devastation all the German plant capacity not necessary to maintain an average European level of living for the German people.

Mr. President, we may have different opinions in America about the policy of Generalissimo Joseph Stalin, but I believe all Americans generally will agree with one remark he made to me in an interview in Moscow in 1945, when, with the utmost solemnity, he pressed his fist against the table and said, "Never again must Germany and Japan be permitted to become able to wage war upon the world."

Mr. President, further I believe and hope:

That German exports and imports shall be properly controlled;

That neither German militarists nor industrialists shall be allowed to plan another war or to conceal their war-making power in any part of the world, including Spain and Argentina;

That German education and German life will be infused with democracy and that only democratic elements, parties, and forces, in Germany will be recognized or assisted by any of the Allied Powers;

That the program shall be administered by an international authority based on the Big Three and the other countries most concerned.

Such a policy, Mr. President, can and will, I submit, lead the world to peace through the United Nations. Such a policy will avoid the road to war through the gates of a cartel internationale to the strains of a hymn of hate.

I shall say no more in criticism of Mr. Dulles' proposal, but since Mr. Dulles is chairman of an honored church committee, speaks inevitably with the prestige conferred by that high office, I shall leave it to an organ of the Episcopal Church to sum up the case against Mr. Dulles' proposal. In its issue of January 30, the weekly magazine, the Witness, on whose board of editors sit some of the most influential clergymen of that church, we find the following judgment:

It is the obligation of the people of those churches to inquire whether his (Mr. Dulles') proposal moves in the direction of the just and durable peace they have commissioned him to seek, also whether it is in harmony

with the principles set forth in what is popularly called the social creed of the churches.

What pagan logic of geopolitics is it that wants "to find a form of joint control which will make it possible to develop the industrial potential of western Germany in the interest of the economic life of western Europe . . ."? Does the sacredness of personality stop at that line? Are the people of eastern Europe to be denied the equal rights to all available opportunities for development, which has been a basic principle in all versions of the church's social creed from the first draft? . . .

The road to moral influence is the same as the road to peace. It is the cooperative use of economic power for the development of all the peoples of the earth according to those principles which were set forth by our churches long before they were ever embodied in the Atlantic and United Nations Charters.

Since Mr. Dulles' plan is contrary to these principles, he should be asked to resign as chairman of the commission of a just and durable peace of the Federal Council of Churches and from his positions of leadership in the World Council of Churches.

Mr. President, while Mr. Dulles works to rebuild the industrial mastery enjoyed by western Germany, other Republicans complete the tragic picture by urging the return to eastern Germany of those provinces now occupied by Poland under the Potsdam agreement. I shall not argue the historical and ethnic claims of Poland to that territory, valid as they are. I point now only to the incalculable mischief such a proposal involves—the deepening of distrust and suspicion between East and West, the encouragement of the always dangerous German supernaturalism, the misery, privation, and despair of millions of Poles who are now permanently settled—at least they believe so—in those provinces. A Polish industry has been painfully built up there; Polish farms are now beginning to flourish there; and historic Polish institutions of learning, having been laboriously transplanted from the East to Silesia, hundreds of miles, are now creating a new Polish culture in those very same provinces which once gave birth to that culture.

In the light of the recent Republican declarations with respect to China, Argentina, the reciprocal-trade agreements program, and the military control of atomic energy and now capped by the open repudiation of Potsdam, as many believe, and the proposal to set up a western bloc incorporating an industrially rearm Germany—I say, Mr. President, in the light of these pronouncements, let us ask the question which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] once asked about the policy of one of our allies: What is the Republican Party up to?

We cannot tell, after 1 month of Republican domination in the Congress what will be the ultimate destination of the party, but we are beginning to be able to tell at least the direction in which it is going. Enough points put down in sequence will begin to form a line.

If what has been said by Republican leaders is a clear indication of the direction of the Republican Party, it only remains to determine how far the line will



reach and with what speed it will be continued. The Republican Party is convicted before history of leading this country in the period between two wars through the gates of alleged collaboration to the treacherous path of isolation in the political and economic affairs of the world. In that period this policy of isolation generally took the negative form. It kept us out of the League of Nations, the World Court, and economic collaboration. But it gave us also in world politics and world economics the strategy of dollar diplomacy. The Government was not used on behalf of the people for peace, but, too often, on behalf of the corporations for profit.

We saw American policy under Republican leadership relieve Germany from paying her due reparations, and instead, American loans, billions of dollars of them, were given to Germany, making us, knowing or unknowing, collaborators in the policy embraced by some European nations of building up a strong Germany as a buffer state against eastern Europe.

We saw a majority of the Republican Party prior to the war oppose the effort of the Government first to throw its weight against Hitler aggression; second, to rearm this country for its own security; and third, to assist the victims of Hitler's aggression, even with economic aid. We know now how dangerously near the brink of disaster those policies brought America and the rest of the world. I will add with pleasure that with the outbreak of war, and through the war, and in many instances since the war, the Republican Party, acting through the able senior Senator from Michigan, reversed its old policy and rendered a valuable contribution not only in winning the war but in laying the foundations of a stable peace in an orderly world.

But, Mr. President, what many people of America feared when the Republican Party came to power after the last war was whether it would carry through with its promised collaboration. It did not do so last time. Many voters in the election of 1920 considered the Republican Party the best vehicle to achieve United States entry into the League of Nations, and many Republican leaders of great stature, such as Ex-President Taft and Mr. Elihu Root, campaigned upon such a platform, but after his election President Harding declared, "The League is dead."

The question today in the minds of every nation in the world—yes, the question in the minds of the ordinary man and woman in America who wants peace through international working together, is, Will America this time move forward upon a high course or will it go back to the tragic road it followed after the last war? It was the Republican Party which gave America direction at the end of the last war and took us down into the abyss that led eventually to depression and war. The Republican Party is again in control of Congress. Again it must assume the responsibility of giving direction to America's course in the world. If the Republican Party fails America it will make America fail the world again.

If these statements of Republican leaders—and they are not all I could name—are any sign, if they are a sign in the political sky, even though no larger

than a man's hand, of the direction of the Republican Party, the course it is following is ominous to the future of America and to the future of the world.

That is the reason, Mr. President, I now call attention to it, with the candor and directness which the gravity of the situation warrants. I raise this issue that this question as to where we are headed can be asked of their party by the rank and file Republicans of this country—by all people who want peace, who want international prosperity, with full employment and well-being at home. It is in the early stages of a disease when care and treatment may prevent long illness or death itself.

If these declarations of responsible Republican leaders are not in the direction that the rank and file of the Republican Party and, indeed, the rank and file of the American people want and so earnestly pray for, it is time that the leaders reexamine their declarations and their steps and, before it is too late, turn about to the course which will be in accord with the ancient democratic, nonimperialistic traditions of America, which will bring us into cooperation with the truly democratic forces and peoples of the world, which will make American leadership the way to, not of war and poverty, but of peace and plenty for mankind.

#### EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York Times of January 29, 1947]

##### WHICH WAY FOR REPUBLICANS?

In his attack on the Hull reciprocal-trade-agreement program as "a gigantic hoax on the American people," Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, says that he is speaking for himself alone and not for the new Republican majority in Congress. We hope that on this issue he will continue to speak for himself alone, or at most for a small company of like-minded colleagues, and that this first blast in the new Senate against the Hull program does not forecast a breaking (on economic grounds) of the present bipartisan front on questions of foreign policy and a return by the Senate Republicans to their prewar position of economic isolation.

What is this gigantic hoax about which Mr. BUTLER is aroused? It is a 12-year-old plan, carefully worked out in theory and in practice, to reduce tariff rates moderately and gradually, in return for equivalent reductions by other nations, in order to widen the area within which goods can be profitably exchanged. The plan is strongly supported, on the basis of experience, by many of our most important, and certainly our most far-sighted business, financial, and farm interests. Its advantages are many-sided. It opens markets for American products. It brings foreign products within reach of the American consumer, who is precisely the same person as the American producer, and thereby serves as a check on an inflationary rise of prices. It strengthens the economy of those nations which believe with us in the merits of the free-enterprise system. It strengthens the free-enterprise system here at home, because it encourages the expansion of production; and the alternative to an expansion of production, as we have seen from fairly recent experience, is curtailment of crops and industrial output on the Government's initiative (AAA and NRA) and an inevitable increase of that very governmental regimentation which the Republicans themselves profess to abhor. Finally, this Hull program corresponds with the realities of our creditor position as a nation.

Here is the United States, with about \$11,000,000,000 of its privately owned capital invested abroad and with more billions of public funds outstanding in foreign countries in the form of the lend-lease settlements, the new credit to Britain and constantly increasing loans (for essential and commendable purposes) being made by the Export-Import Bank from day to day. How are interest and principal on this huge public and private investment to be paid? It cannot be paid in gold, for we have already cornered most of the world's monetary gold and we could not put any more gold to good use even if we got it. It cannot be paid in silver, for we have enough silver mines of our own. It cannot be paid in foreign paper money, for we will not accept paper money in such transactions, and the paper would be of no value to us if we did, unless we converted it into foreign goods. Foreign goods, in short—goods we need and can use and will buy if they become available without the penalty of too high tariffs—provide the only medium through which international obligations can be settled. Any proposal to increase the difficulties in the way of such settlement is sheer folly from the point of view of a creditor nation like the United States.

There is an immensely practical political consideration in all this, as well as the considerations which arise from a sound view of public policy. There cannot be the slightest doubt that the Republican Party has benefited greatly, in a political way, from the broad bipartisan agreement which has been achieved on such questions as the United Nations, on Russia, and on the atomic bomb. The existence of this broad agreement on foreign policy has made it possible for the Republican Party to rid itself, in the eyes of the independent voters of the country, of much of the old and unfortunately well-earned charge of prewar isolationism, and enabled it to focus the attention of the voters, and particularly of the independent voters, on the domestic, and more vulnerable, record of the Democratic Party during the long period of its present ascendancy in Washington. This advantage will be lost, and the Republican Party will find itself once more in the position of having to convince the independent voters that it is not the party of isolation, if Senator BUTLER, of Nebraska, is permitted to lead a Republican crusade against the Hull trade program.

#### EXHIBIT 2

[From the Washington Post of January 29, 1947]

##### ATOMIC HEARINGS

The old issue of civilian versus military control of atomic energy, threshed out and seemingly settled in the long debate last summer over establishment of the Atomic Energy Commission, has been raised again in Senate hearings on the confirmation of David E. Lillenthal. It is an issue which ought never to have arisen in a free society. The very consideration of it suggests a condition of panic. For the subordination of the military to civil authority is a cornerstone of the concept of government by consent. It is astounding to find this principle called into question by men of Senator VANDENBERG's or Senator MILLIKIN's caliber.

Senator MILLIKIN asked Mr. Lillenthal on Monday: "Why shouldn't the military liaison board sit in on all Atomic Energy Commission meetings? What would be the difficulty?" It is a testimonial, we think, to Mr. Lillenthal's self-control and tact that he was able to treat this query as a rational one. The answer, of course, is that this would put the Army precisely in the position from which the Senate with so much difficulty ousted it last summer—on the Commission itself. The long contention between the House and Senate, between the May-Johnson bill and the

McMahon bill, was whether the military, as such, should have Commission membership. Senator VANDENBERG, out of a regard, we suppose, for the principle of civilian supremacy, was one of the sponsors of a settlement which denied membership to the military while providing for a due recognition of their interest and importance through a military liaison board. It is indeed paradoxical to find him now "underscoring" a proposal that would put the Army back in the saddle.

Still more strange is the fantasy entertained by Senator KNOWLAND that all meetings of the Atomic Energy Commission should be attended by members of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. This would amount, patently, to a direct violation of the separation of powers enjoined by the Constitution. It is not the business of the legislature in our political system to engage in the day-to-day details of administration. Senator KNOWLAND's proposal, also "underscored" by Senator VANDENBERG, would leave the development of atomic energy to a committee of Congress instead of to the Atomic Energy Commission created by Congress for this express purpose. Nothing like such an invasion of the executive domain has been suggested since Civil War days when Ben Wade and some of his congressional colleagues sought to take over from President Lincoln and his Cabinet the management of the war effort. And, in their behalf, it could at least be said that they were trying to prevent, not to promote, military domination.

In the present position of international relations, it cannot be doubted that the military aspects of atomic energy are of prime importance. David Lillenthal understands this as well as any Senator. He can be counted upon to be as zealous as any general for the maintenance of American superiority in the atomic field. Patriotism is not an attribute peculiar to men in uniform. And nothing, indeed, could be more inimical to the safety of the Nation than the idea, born of hysteria, that only the Army can keep a secret, only the Army can shape policies for our defense. The Army has already demonstrated its incompetence in the development of atomic energy. In peacetime, scientists will not, because they cannot, work under its sterile domination. From the viewpoint of expediency, therefore, military control is self-defeating. From the viewpoint of principle, it is thoroughly abhorrent.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. TOBEY, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Dillon S. Myer, of Ohio, to be Administrator of the United States Housing Authority in the National Housing Agency, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

By Mr. BUCK, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

James W. Lauderdale, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1947, to which office he was appointed during the last recess of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Dal M. Lemmon, to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph E. Brown, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harvey Erickson, of Washington, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. WHERRY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified forthwith of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO FRIDAY

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Friday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Friday, February 7, 1947, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 5, 1947:

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Maj. Gen. Clarence Self Ridley (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Henry Conger Pratt, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. James Eugene Chaney (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Joseph Warren Stillwell, United States Army, died October 12, 1946.

Lt. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Robert Charliwood Richardson Jr., United States Army, retired October 31, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Oscar Wolverton Griswold (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. William Hood Simpson, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Harold Lee George, United States Army, retired December 31, 1946.

Lt. Gen. Charles Philip Hall (brigadier general, U. S. Army), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Charles Hartwell Bonesteel, United States Army, retired January 31, 1947.

##### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Maj. Gen. George Fleming Moore (colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Harold Lee George, United States Army, appointed major general July 18, 1946.

Maj. Gen. William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr. (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Harold Doolittle, United States Army, resigned July 22, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Walter Melville Robertson (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Henry Tacitus Burgin, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Archibald Vincent Arnold (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. William Edga. Shedd, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Junius Wallace Jones (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Lawton Collins, United States Army, retired August 31, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Louis Aleck Craig (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Maxwell Murray, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Frank William Milburn (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Thomas Alexander Terry, United States Army, retired September 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. George Jacob Richards (colonel, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Fulton Quintus Cincinnatus Gardner, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Charles Wolcott Ryder (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Edward Postell King, Jr., United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Stafford LeRoy Irwin (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Richard Kerens Sutherland, United States Army, retired November 30, 1946.

Maj. Gen. John William Leonard (colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Daniel Isom Sultan, United States Army, died January 14, 1947.

Maj. Gen. Idwal Hubert Edwards (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Clarence Self Ridley, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Grandison Gardner (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. James Eugene Chaney, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Brig. Gen. Franklin Otis Carroll (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. John Clifford Hodges Lee, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Charles Carl Chauncey (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Oscar Wolverton Griswold, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Edward Michael Powers (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Leonard Townsend Gerow, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Bonner Wolfe (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. Charles Philip Hall, United States Army, nominated for appointment as major general.

Maj. Gen. Alfred Maximilian Gruenther (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States, to fill an original vacancy.

Brig. Gen. James Kirk (colonel, Ordnance Department), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the



United States as Assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. Gladeon Marcus Barnes, United States Army, retired.

Brig. Gen. Spencer Ball Akin (colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Chief Signal Officer, with the rank of major general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Maj. Gen. Harry Clyde Ingles, United States Army, who retires March 31, 1947.

Brig. Gen. William Herschel Middleswart (lieutenant colonel, Quartermaster Corps), Army of the United States, for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States as Assistant to the Quartermaster General, with the rank of brigadier general, for a period of 4 years from date of appointment, vice Brig. Gen. John Brandon Franks, United States Army, deceased.

The following-named officer for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of Public Law 449, Seventy-ninth Congress, June 26, 1946:

TO BE PROFESSOR OF ELECTRICITY AT THE UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Col. James Wilson Green, Jr., (major, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Orval Ray Cook (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Emmett O'Donnell, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Malcolm Cummings Grow (colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edwin William Rawlings (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

#### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Eugene Martin Foster (lieutenant colonel, Finance Department), Army of the United States.

Col. George Warren Mundy (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Leander Putt (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. William Maurice Morgan (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Samuel Robert Brentnall (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Norton Yates (captain, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. George Craig Stewart (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Hubert Don Hoover (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Ernest Marion Brannon (lieutenant colonel, Judge Advocate General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Edwin Kennedy Wright (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Turner Ashby Sims, Jr. (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the

United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Eustace Maduro Peixotto (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. Bryant LeMaire Boatner (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James McGormack, Jr. (captain, Corps of Engineers), Army of the United States.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Brig. Gen. William Henry Draper, Jr. (colonel, Infantry Reserve), Army of the United States.

#### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Col. Earle Levan Johnson (temporary colonel, Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OF THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

#### TO BE MAJOR GENERALS OF THE LINE

Maj. Gen. Sumter de Leon Lowry, Jr., Florida National Guard, to date from September 12, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Norman Everard Hendrickson, Minnesota National Guard, to date from September 15, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Kenneth Frank Cramer, Connecticut National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Maj. Gen. William Hamilton Sands, Virginia National Guard, to date from October 23, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Charles Christian Haffner, Jr., Illinois National Guard, to date from November 7, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Leo Myron Kreber, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 11, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Ray Cook Fountain, Iowa National Guard, to date from November 19, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Jim Dan Hill, Wisconsin National Guard, to date from November 19, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Edward James Stackpole, Jr., Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from November 20, 1946.

Maj. Gen. Joseph Arthur Teece, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 29, 1946.

#### TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS OF THE LINE

Brig. Gen. Winston Weidner Kratz, Missouri National Guard, to date from July 3, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Stanford Willis Gregory, Colorado National Guard, to date from August 6, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Hal Lowndes Muldrow, Jr., Oklahoma National Guard, to date from September 5, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Phillip Charles Bettenburg, Minnesota National Guard, to date from September 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Charles Clarence Curtis, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from September 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Charles Ralph Fox, West Virginia National Guard, to date from October 10, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Louis Evans Boutwell, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. John Uberto Calkins, Jr., California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. David Philip Hardy, California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Chester Arthur Files, Rhode Island National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Harrison Hudelson, California National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Howard Sanford Searle, Kansas National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Roy Washington Kenny, Oklahoma National Guard, to date from October 22, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Elgan Clayton Robertson, Arkansas National Guard, to date from October 22, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Reginald William Buzzell, Vermont National Guard, to date from October 28, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Otto Edward Sandman, California National Guard, to date from October 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Edward Clark Rose, New Jersey National Guard, to date from October 31, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Richard Smykal, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 7, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Kenneth Cooper, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 11, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Cecil Brainard Whitcomb, Ohio National Guard, to date from November 11, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Daniel Bursk Strickler, Pennsylvania National Guard, to date from November 20, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Harry Lynn Bolen, Illinois National Guard, to date from November 29, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Alexander Gallatin Paxton, Mississippi National Guard, to date from December 2, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Clayton Price Kerr, Texas National Guard, to date from December 13, 1946.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS, ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Brig. Gen. Curtis Dion O'Sullivan, California National Guard, to date from August 13, 1946.

Brig. Gen. William Henry Harrison, Jr., Massachusetts National Guard, to date from September 30, 1946.

Brig. Gen. George Hilton Butler, Tennessee National Guard, to date from October 4, 1946.

Brig. Gen. Vincent Henry Jacobs, Massachusetts National Guard, to date from October 15, 1946.

#### IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Donald B. Duncan, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1947:

##### UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Del M. Lemmon to be United States district judge for the northern district of California.

##### UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Joseph E. Brown to be United States attorney for the southern district of Mississippi.

Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

#### WITHDRAWAL

Executive nomination withdrawn from the Senate February 5, 1947:

##### POSTMASTER

Mrs. Rilla M. Schaffer to be postmaster at Idanha, in the State of Oregon.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1947

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. H. Calvin Knock, pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Scottsbluff, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the source of knowledge and truth and in Thy hand is the destinw of mankind. Thou hast endowed men with many rights, privi-